UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/427,180	10/26/1999	JEAN-PAUL ACCARIE	1807.0804	2855

5514 7590 03/18/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
PHAN, TRI H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2661	8

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/427,180	ACCARIE, JEAN-PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tri H. Phan	2661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,7 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because all blocks in Figures 1, 4 and 6 should be labeled with descriptive legends based on 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(o) for supporting the objection in the Rules and M.P.E.P. (i.e. there are no labeled descriptions in Figures 1-5). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the headings were not included in the specification to identify the field of invention, the background or related art of invention, summary of invention, and details description of the invention.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without

underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
(1) Field of the Invention.
(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it should be a single paragraph, see MPEP § 608.01(b). Also, in the abstract, the phrase "**(Figure 9)**" standing by itself at the bottom of the page should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1, 6, 17, 22 and 30 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 because of the following informalities:

- In regard to claim 1, lines 3-4, "the same communication protocol" does not have clear antecedent basis; it is suggested to change to --- same communication protocol ---.

- Regarding claim 6, line 3, "the bandwidth" does not have clear antecedent basis; it is suggested to change to --- bandwidth ---.

- Claim 17 is rejected for the same objection's reason given in Claim 1.

- Claim 22 is rejected for the same objection's reason given in Claim 6.

- In regard to claim 30, lines 2-3, "the flows" does not have clear antecedent basis; it is suggested to change to --- flows ---.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1, 3, 13, 17, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- In regard to claim 1, it recites the limitations "said media" in line 3, "said information" in lines 6-7. There are insufficient antecedent bases for these limitations in the claim 1.

- Regarding claim 3, it recites the limitation "said transmission operation" in lines 4-5 is vague and unclear because it is unclear which transmission operation, i.e. the first or second transmission, is referred to.

- In regard to claim 13, the recitation "one of the transmission operations" in line 2 is vague and unclear because it is unclear which transmission operation, i.e. the first or second transmission or reception, is referred to. Similar problems exist in Claim 31, Line 3.

- Regarding claim 17, it recites the limitation "said media" in line 3. There are insufficient antecedent bases for these limitations in the claim 17.

- In regard to claim 31, Line 9, it recites the limitation "and/or" " is vague and unclear because the term "and/or" can be interpreted as either "and and or" or "and or or".

- Regarding claim 35, the recitation "several information flows" in line 3 is vague and indefinite because the recitation in claim appears to raise in question as to the limit of the claim scope, wherein the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

10. Claims 1-2 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Lo et al.** (U.S.6,324,178).

- In regard to claim 1 and 17, **Lo** discloses in Figs. 2A, 3A-B, 4 and in the respective portions of the specification that the device and method for transferring data with the same protocol between domains of differing data formats, i.e. between an IEEE 1394 communication domain and an Ethernet communication domain; wherein the nodes 210-218 ("*first communication means*") coupling to the IEEE 1394 serial communication bus 240 ("*first communication medium*") as disclosed in Fig. 2A; Col. 4, Lines 47-55; send the data packets or frames being compatible with the first communication domain format ("*first format*") to the bridge circuit 220 ("*second communication means*"). After receiving the data packets, the bridge circuit 220 assembles data packets, i.e. reformatting, into the second communication domain format ("*second format*") different from the first format and effected by the bridge circuit as disclosed in Col. 3, Lines 26-59, then transmits over the Ethernet communication bus 250

("*second communication medium*") as disclosed in details of Figs. 3A-B, 5, 7; Col. 5, Line 62 through Col. 6, Line 29.

- Regarding claims 2 and 18, **Lo** further discloses the data packets assemblage ("reformatting operation") is effected on the information of the first format following any initialization operation (For example see Figs. 5, 8B-C; wherein the source address of the received data packet, i.e. the IEEE 1394 data packet in Figs. 8B-C, is assigned upon the bus reset as disclosed in Col. 4, Lines 59-64; and assembled ("reformatted") in the source address of the header section 326 as described in details of Fig. 5; Col. 8, Lines 6-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3-16, 19-36 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lo et al.** (U.S.6,324,178) in view of **Ludtke et al.** (U.S.6,233,611).

- In regard to claims 3 and 19, **Lo** discloses all the subject matter of the claimed invention as discussed in part 10 of the rejection above, except the method of *determining the need to reformat received digital information having the first format and, when reformatting is*

necessary, the reformatting operation and the transmission operation are performed on the received digital information. However, such implementation is known in the art.

For example, **Ludtke** discloses that the media manager determines the necessity of the conversion from one format into another format, and if necessary, the media manager will control the format conversion for the data transfer operation (For example see Col. 3, Lines 30-35; Col. 11, Lines 49-57).

Ludtke also discloses in Figs. 1-6 and in the respective portions of the specification, the media manager manages applications and digital media devices ("communication means"), such as video camera 10, video cassette recorder 12, settop box 13 and television 11, interconnecting within the digital network through the IEEE 1394 serial bus architecture ("shared communication medium") as IEEE 1394 cables 15, 16 and 18 (For example see Col. 2, Line 64 through Col. 3, Line 19) and manages the flow and format of data transfer operations between the physical devices, including converting the data into a different format for transfer as specified in Col. 3, Lines 9-19.

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the media manager by using the device control module and application program instructions as taught by **Ludtke** in Col. 4, Lines 12-67 into the program's instructions in **Lo**'s system as disclosed in Col. 7, Lines 28-38; with the motivation being to improve the ability to transfer data with different data formats between domains and provide data flow management, services for client applications between devices on the network.

- Regarding claims 4-7, 14-15, 20-23 and 32-33, **Lo** further fails to disclose the method of determination of the need to reformat takes into account of the source and destination address, transmission channel identifier of the received information and bandwidth to be used during the second transmission operation. However, such implementation is known in the art.

For example, **Ludtke** discloses the method of determination of the need to reformat takes into account of the source and destination address (wherein, after a bus reset or the change of the bus, the bus manager 70 of the media manager assigns new ID values to all devices and creates new DCMs 56 which includes the source and destination address of the DCM moduleID value as disclosed in Fig. 5, Col. 11, Lines 15-29; for all devices as disclosed in Col. 12, Lines 24-33, transmission channel identifier (wherein each DCM moduleID value is assigned by the bus manager for each device in the IEEE 1394 bus with multiple channels architecture as disclosed in Col. 1, Lines 32-37; Col. 16, Lines 32-42; Col. 17, Line 59 through Col. 18, Line 4) and bandwidth to be used (wherein the device control module manager 54 of the media manager manages and allocates the resource allocation as disclosed in Col. 5, Lines 19-27; Col. 13, Lines 18-23).

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the media manager and application program instructions for taking into account of the source and destination address, transmission channel identifier and bandwidth to be used in the determination of the need to reformat the received data as taught by **Ludtke** into the program's instructions in **Lo**'s system as disclosed in Col. 7, Lines 28-38; with the motivation being to improve the ability for providing data flow management and services for client applications between devices on the network.

- In regard to claims 8-9 and 24-25, **Lo** also fails to disclose the method of *detecting the information of the first format in order to reformat the transmission data and stopping the reformatting performed on the received data having the first format*. However, such implementation is known in the art.

For example, **Ludtke** discloses the method of *detecting the information of the first format in order to reformat the transmission data* (wherein, for example, the data flow manager in the media manager receives and analyzes the moduleID value of the request for obtaining the topology map, then finds the appropriate data format for the transmission data as disclosed in Col. 11, Lines 15-51) *and stopping the reformatting performed on the received data having the first format* (wherein, for example, the data flow manager 64 in the media manager controls the operation of reformatting the received data as disclosed in Col. 11, Lines 49-57).

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the method of *stopping the reformatting performed on the received data having the first format* as taught by **Ludtke** into the program's instructions in **Lo**'s system as disclosed in Col. 7, Lines 28-38; with the motivation being to improve the ability for providing data flow management and services for client applications between devices on the network.

- Regarding claims 10-11 and 26-28, **Lo** further discloses *the communication medium is in accordance with standard IEEE 1394* (For example see the IEEE 1394 communication bus 240 in Fig. 2A) and *the first communication medium and the second communication medium are*

not merged (For example see the IEEE 1394 communication bus 240 and the Ethernet IEEE 802.3 communication bus 250 in Fig. 2A), but fails to disclose that *the first communication medium and the second communication medium are merged.* However, such implementation is known in the art.

For example, **Ludtke** discloses *the first communication medium and the second communication medium are merged* (wherein, for example, all the devices such as the video camera, the video cassette recorder, the settop box, the television, the computer are used in the IEEE 1394 communication bus 15-18 of Fig. 1).

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the method of *merging the first and second communication medium* as taught by **Ludtke** into the **Lo**'s system with the motivation being to improve the ability for providing an open and flexible services for client applications between devices on the network by using the media manager as disclosed in Col. 4, Lines 59-67.

- In regard to claims 12 and 30, **Lo** further discloses the bridge circuit provides the bi-directional data flow between the nodes of the first and second communication domains ("isolating flows between two buses") as disclosed in details of Fig. 2A, Col. 5, Lines 24-35; Col. 5, Line 62 through Col. 6, Line 8.

Ludtke also discloses the DCM manager 54 of the media manager controls the data flow (See Abstract) by grouping the devices and subdevices (For example see Col. 6, Lines 19-27) based on the abstraction service as disclosed in Col. 7, Lines 6-36.

- Regarding claims 13 and 31, **Lo** does discloses the transmission over the IEEE 1394 communication bus with the asynchronous mode, but fails to disclose the other transmission with isochronous. However, wherein the IEEE 1394 can support both isochronous and asynchronous format data transfer, and the implementation such as the transmission over the isochronous and asynchronous format data transfer is known in the art.

For example, **Ludtke** discloses the transmission is performed in the isochronous and the other in asynchronous format data transfer as disclosed in Col. 14, Lines 45-50; Col. 15, Lines 21-27; over the IEEE 1394 serial bus which supports both isochronous and asynchronous data transfer as disclosed in Col. 1, Lines 15-20.

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the method of *the transmission is performed in the isochronous and the other in asynchronous mode* as taught by **Ludtke** into the **Lo**'s system with the motivation being to improve the ability for providing an open and flexible services for client applications between devices on the network by using the media manager as disclosed in Col. 4, Lines 59-67.

- In regard to claims 16 and 34, **Lo** further fails to disclose the *determination of sufficient resource before transmitting data; otherwise, considering the transmitted information is lost.* However, such implementation is known in the art.

For example, **Ludtke** discloses the DCM 56 manages the resource sharing and resource queuing ("*determination of sufficient resource before transmitting data*") as disclosed in Col. 9, Lines 26-39. **Ludtke** does not specifically disclose "*the transmitted information is considered to*

be lost when the resource is insufficient. However, **Ludtke** does notify the entity when available as disclosed in Col. 9, Lines 26-39; or triggers the application when memory buffers have been filled as disclosed in Col. 14, Lines 45-50 in the consideration of the transmitted information to be lost for retransmission data.

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the method of *determination of sufficient resource before transmitting data; otherwise, considering the retransmitted information when the resource is available* as taught by **Ludtke** into the **Lo**'s system with the motivation being to improve the ability for managing data flow between devices on the network by using the media manager as disclosed in Col. 4, Lines 59-67.

- Regarding claims 35 and 36, **Lo** does disclose *the communication means is adapted to process several information flows in bidirection* as disclosed in Col. 5, Lines 27-35, but fails to disclose *the communication means is adapted to process several information flows in parallel.* However, such implementation is known in the art.

For example, **Ludtke** discloses *the communication means is adapted to process several information flows in parallel* (wherein, for example, the event manager 62 broadcast the event notifications to all interested parties as disclosed in Col. 9, Line 59 through Col. 10, Line 10 over the IEEE 1394 serial bus which allows multiple applications to simultaneously transmit as specified in Col. 1, Lines 32-37).

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement *the communication means is adapted to process several*

information flows in parallel as taught by **Ludtke** into the **Lo**'s system with the motivation being to improve the ability for managing data flow between devices on the network through the IEEE 1394 serial bus, by using the media manager as disclosed in Col. 4, Lines 59-67.

- In regard to claims 54-56, **Lo** also discloses in Figs. 4-5 and in the respective portions of the specification for the memory unit ("*information storage means*") which can be read by a computer or microprocessor storing instructions of a bridge software ("*computer program*") as disclosed in Col. 7, Line 28 through Col. 8, Line 5.

Ludtke further discloses in Figs. 1, 4, and in the respective portions of the specification for the information storage means which is removable, partially or completely (floppy disk, memory which use to store the download program software (modules) as disclosed in Col. 6, Lines 51-64; Col. 9, Lines 40-58), and can be read and executed by a computer or microprocessor storing instructions of a computer program (For example see Col. 4, Lines 21-22) in order to manage data flow and format of data transfer, services for client applications on the general or specific devices on the network as disclosed in Col. 2, Lines 13-41.

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use *the removable, partially or completely information storage means uses to store the program software and can read, executes by the microprocessor* as taught by **Ludtke** into the **Lo**'s system as engineering choices for the desired information storage on the IEEE 1394 network.

13. Claims 37-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lo et al.** (U.S.6,324,178) in view of **Ludtke et al.** (U.S.6,233,611), further in view of **Tanno et al.** (U.S.6,064,772).

- In regard to claims 37-39, **Lo** does discloses the communication means is the IEEE 1394 communication bus, but fails to specifically disclose that *the communication means is adapted with the digital video, JPEG 2000, and MPEG2 standard formats.*

Ludtke discloses the IEEE 1394 serial bus supports general and specific media devices such as video camera, video cassette recorder, settop box, television, etc. (See Figs. 1 and 4) for audio/video network as disclosed in Col. 1, Lines 60-66; however, the digital video, JPEG 2000, and MPEG2 standard formats are well known in the art for image coding method which can be downloaded and installed as disclosed in Col. 9, Lines 40-58.

Tanno discloses in Figs. 1, 2, 5, and in the respective portions of the specification for *the digital video, JPEG 2000, and MPEG2 standard formats are used over the communication means* (IEEE 1394 standard bus in Fig. 1; Col. 3, Lines 49-58; Col. 5, Lines 23-33) and where the "JPEG 2000 standard format" is just another version of the JPEG standard.

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use *the communication means is adapted with the digital video, JPEG, and MPEG2 standard formats* as taught by **Tanno** into the combination of **Ludtke** and **Lo**'s system with the motivation being to specify the ability for using the well known coding format such as JPEG and MPEG over the communication bus such as IEEE 1394.

- Regarding claims 40-53, **Lo** further discloses in Figs. 2A-B, and in the respective portions of the specification for the network (For example see Col. 1, Lines 8-15), computer, display means, memory (Figs. 2A-B).

Ludtke further discloses in Figs. 1, 4, and in the respective portions of the specification for the network, computer, memory, display means, modem, camera, video recorder, and television receiver.

Tanno further discloses in Fig. 1 and in the respective portions of the specification for the network, computer, memory, display means, camera, camcorder, video recorder, television receiver, facsimile machine, copier, printer, scanner, photographic apparatus.

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use *the facsimile machine, copier, printer, scanner, photographic apparatus* as taught by **Tanno** into the combination of **Ludtke** and **Lo**'s system as the general and specific media devices over the communication bus such as IEEE 1394 communication bus.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fu et al. (U.S.5,703,965), **Iijima** (U.S.6,286,071), **Tateyama** (U.S.6,018,816), **Kuver et al.** (U.S.6,438,604), **Nagasawa et al.** (U.S.6,384,928), **Kishon** (U.S.6,356,968), **Ogino et al.** (U.S.6,038,625), **Ueda et al.** (EP0758827A2) and **Kawai et al.** (EP0715459A2) are all cited to show devices and methods for improving data transfers communication architectures over networks such as IEEE 1394, which are considered pertinent to the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri H. Phan whose telephone number is (703) 305-7444. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W. Olms can be reached on (703) 305-4703.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tri H. Phan
February 26, 2003